DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 088 809 SP 007 772

AUTHOR	Redwine, Judith A.
TITLE	A Follow-Up Study of 1967-1972 Division of Education Graduates of Indiana University at South Bend.
INSTITUTION	Indiana Univ., South Bend. School of Education.
PUB DATE	Jan 74
NOTE	55p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15
DESCRIPTORS	College Graduates; *Graduate Surveys; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Tables (Data); *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

The objectives of this study were to collect general background information from all persons who had received degrees through Indiana University at South Bend's Division of Education during the years 1967-72 and to obtain an evaluation of the division's teacher education program from these same persons. The teacher education program consisted of four degree areas: undergraduate elementary education, undergraduate secondary education, graduate elementary education, and graduate special education. Questionnaires were sent to all of the 860 persons who had graduated between 1967 and 1972; responses were received from 637 graduates. Findings of the survey are presented in 24 tables in this document. A discussion of the findings is also included. A copy of the questionnaire sent out to the graduates is appended, along with copies of the cover letters from the mailings. (DDO)

ED 088809

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF 1967-1972 DIVISION OF EDUCATION GRADUATES OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY AT SOUTH BEND

by

Judith A. Redwine, Ph.D.

Indiana University at South Bend
South Bend, Indiana
January, 1974

SP 007 772

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was conducted through the cooperative effort and support of many persons. Dr. Eldon Ruff and Mr. Kent Laudeman provided much administrative assistance. The Program Directors, Dr. Wayne Krepel, Dr. Gerald Dudley, Dr. Greg Baur, Dr. John Mefford and Dr. James Yutzy assisted in the preparation of the questionnaire as did Dr. Ruff and Mr. Laudeman. The Division secretaries prcvided invaluable help in preparing this document as did Mr. Steve Holmes of the I.U.S.B. Computer Center and Mr. Steve McNally of the Notre Dame Computer Center.

Finally, very special thanks to Dr. Bob DuVall. His research experience and expertise as well has his encouragement were vitally important to me from the inception of this study to its conclusion.

Judith A. Redwine

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements ii

List of Tables iv

Chapter Page

I Problem 1

II Method 3

III Results 7

IV Discussion 35

V Conclusions 40

Appendix A 41

Appendix B 46

Appendix C 49

References 50

List of Tables

Table		Page
1.	Age of Respondents by Undergraduate Program Completed through I.U.S.B. Division of Education	8
2.	Age of Respondents by Graduate Program Completed through I.U.S.B. Division of Education	9
3.	Sex of Respondents by Programs Completed through I.U.S.B. Division of Education	10
4.	Years of Teaching Experience by Program Completed through I.U.S.B. Division of Education	11
5.	School District in which Teaching Respondents were Employed	12
6.	District of Employment by Areas of School Experiences	13
7.	Educational Background by Type of Certificate Held	14
8.	I.U.S.B. Undergraduate Program Completed by Reason for not Teaching at Present	15
9.	Date of Undergraduate Degree by Reason for not Teaching at Present	16
10.	Number of Hours Completed through I.U.S.B. Division of Education for Graduate Degree	17
11.	Number of Hours Completed through I.U.S.B. Division of Education for Undergraduate Degree	18
12.	Summary of Ratings of Instruction Received while taking Courses through I.U.S.B. Division of Education by Graduate and Undergraduate Programs Completed	20
13.	Summary of Ratings of Program Advising Received while taking Courses through I.U.S.B. Division of Education by Graduate and Undergraduate Programs Completed	21
14.	Summary of Ratings for Instruction and Program Advising Received while taking Courses through I.U.S.B. Division of Education	22

Table Page

15. Summary of Responses to Rating of F100 by Undergraduate Program Completed through I.U.S.B. Division of Education 24

16. Summary of Responses to Ratings of P280 by Undergraduate Program Completed through I.U.S.B. Division of Education 25

17. Summary of Responses to Rating of Methods Courses by Undergraduate Program Completed through I.U.S.B. Division of Education 26

18. Summary of Responses to Rating of Field Experiences other than Student Teaching by Undergraduate Program Completed through I.U.S.B. Division of Education 27

19. Summary of Ratings for Introduction to Teaching (F100), Human Development and Learning (P280), Methods courses, and Field Experiences 28

20. Summary of Ratings of Adequacy of Professional Preparation for Student Teaching by Undergraduate Program Completed at I.U.S.B. 30

21. Summary of Ratings of University Supervisor for Student Teaching by Undergraduate Program Completed at I.U.S.B. 31

22. Summary of Ratings of Supervising Teacher for Student Teaching by Undergraduate Program Completed at I.U.S.B. 32

23. Summary of Ratings of Appropriateness of School Situation for Student Teaching by Undergraduate Program Completed at I.U.S.B. 33

24. Summary of Ratings for the following Aspects of Student Teaching: Adequacy of Professional Preparation, University Supervisor, Supervising Teacher and Appropriateness of School Situation 34

CHAPTER I

Problem

A follow-up study of all Indiana University at South Bend (I.U.S.B.) graduates from 1967 through 1971 was conducted by DuVall (1972). His study "was intended to be a beginning in the collection and dissemination of knowledge concerning the unique character of I.U.S.B.'s graduates [p. 2]." The present study was a continuation of this intent with a concentration on the graduates of the Division of Education. The evaluation of instruction component included in the earlier study was expanded considerably for the present study.

Specific Objectives

Specific objectives for the present study were to collect general background information from all persons who had received degrees through I.U.S.B.'s Division of Education during the years 1967 through 1972 and to obtain an evaluation of the Division's teacher education program from these same persons. The Division teacher education program included four degree areas: undergraduate elementary education, undergraduate secondary education, graduate elementary education, and graduate special education.

Evaluation of several aspects of the teacher education program was included in the present study. These aspects

included the instruction and program advising these graduates had received while taking courses in the I.U.S.B. Division of Education. Also included in this evaluation were various components of the undergraduate teacher education program; specifically: introductory courses Introduction to Teaching (F100) and Human Development and Learning (P280), methods courses, field experiences other than student teaching, and student teaching. Student teaching was evaluated on four points: adequacy of professional preparation, university supervisor, supervising teacher, and the appropriateness of the school situation. The respondents were asked to rate each of these aspects of the teacher education program as outstanding, good, fair, or poor.

Hypotheses

It was hypothesized that there would be no difference in the distribution of respondents among the ratings: outstanding, good, and fair and poor combined, for each aspect of the teacher education program.

CHAPTER II

Method

Design

Instrument. The instrument (Appendix A) and cover letters (Appendix B) used in this study were designed to meet the criteria for mailout questionnaires as suggested by Best, 1959; Borg & Gall, 1971; DuVall, 1973; Furno, 1966; Levine & Gordon, 1958; Good, 1959; and Mouly, 1963. Items 1-11 and 22-24 were designed to collect general background information concerning: age, sex, years of teaching experience, where presently teaching or reason for not teaching at present, educational background, type of degree program(s) completed through I.U.S.B., date degree(s) were received, number of hours completed through the I.U.S.B. Division of Education and type of teaching certificate held. Items 12-21 were used to obtain an evaluation of the following aspects of the I.U.S.B. Division of Education teacher education program: introductory courses Introduction to Teaching (F100) and Human Development and Learning (P280), methods courses, field experiences other than student teaching, student teaching (adequacy of professional preparation, university supervisor, supervising teacher, and appropriateness of school situation), instruction in general, and program advising services.

Closed form type questions were used to secure categorized data; the set of response choices for each item was mutually exclusive and exhaustive. Respondents were invited to make additional comments throughout the questionnaire. A representative sample of these comments may be found in Appendix C. The entire set of completed questionnaires was retained and may be examined in the I.U.S.B. Library.

Statistical Design. The responses to items 12-21 were submitted to a Chi square analysis with:

E_1 = Number of "Outstanding" responses expected = $\frac{O_{Total}}{3}$

E_2 = Number of "Good" responses expected = $\frac{O_{Total}}{3}$

E_3 = Number of "Fair" and "Poor" responses expected = $\frac{O_{Total}}{3}$

Where significant effects occurred visual examination indicated whether the data were skewed in a positive direction (toward "Outstanding") or in a negative direction (toward "Fair/Poor").

Subjects. The entire set of I.U.S.B. Division of Education graduates from 1967-1972 comprised the subjects for this study. There was a total of 860 persons in this set.

Procedure

The specific objectives and subjects for this study were determined, then the instrument and letters of transmittal were designed. These were then tested with a small number of subjects and revised appropriately. The instruments were coded in order to determine which graduates had responded to the first mailing. The first mailing included a letter of transmittal, the instrument, and a stamped, addressed return envelope. A second mailing was made five weeks after the first. This mailing differed from the first in that the letter of transmittal was different and that this mailing involved only those graduates who had not responded to the first mailing.

Reliability. The reliability of items 1,2, and 5-11 was checked using data available in graduate files for a small random sample (3%) of the respondents.

Analysis of data. Every item from 1 through 11 was crossed with every item from 12 through 24. In addition, items 1,2, and 3 were each crossed with items 6 and 10, items 5 and 6 were each crossed with item 10 and item 7 was crossed with item 8. The resulting matrices summarized frequency count, percent of row, percent of column, and percent of total for each cell formed by the crossing of any two items. The data were summarized with and without missing data. Chi square was used to determine whether

observed distribution of respondents was significantly different from the expected distribution for items 12-21.

Where significant differences were found, visual examination was used to determine whether the data were skewed in a positive or in a negative direction.

Only selected portions of the total set of data are presented in this paper. The complete set of data is retained in the I.U.S.B. Library and may be examined upon request.

CHAPTER III

Results

Responses were received from 455 graduates (52.9%) on the first mailing. An additional 182 responses (21.2%) were received as a result of the second mailing. This total of 637 responses represented 74.1% of the 1967-1972 I.U.S.B. Division of Education graduates.

General Background Information

Tables 1-11 summarize the general background information collected through this study. These data are presented in the form of frequency count and percent of row for each cell in the matrix under discussion. No statistical analysis was done on these data.

TABLE I

Age of Respondents by Undergraduate Program Completed through I.U.S.B. Division of Education

Undergraduate Program / Age	No Response	Elementary	Secondary	*Neither	Row Total
18-24	1 .8	100 79.4	23 18.3	2 1.6	126 19.8
25-34	8 2.9	129 46.2	39 14.0	103 36.9	279 43.9
35-49	3 1.6	94 50.3	19 10.2	71 38.0	187 29.4
50-64	0 0.0	20 47.6	3 7.1	19 45.2	42 6.6
65+	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 100.0	1 .2
No response	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 100.0	0 0.0	1 .2
Column Total	12 1.9	343 53.9	85 13.4	196 30.8	636* 100.0

* Includes respondents who received graduate, but not undergraduate degree, from IUSB Division of Education.

** Rounding off error.

TABLE 2

Age of Respondents by Graduate Program Completed through I.U.S.B. Division of Education

Graduate Program / Age	No Response	Elementary	Special Educatio-	Neither*	Row Total
18-24	24 19.0	6 4.8	0 0.0	96 76.2	126 19.8
25-34	34 12.2	121 43.5	10 3.6	113 40.6	278 43.8
35-49	27 14.4	90 48.1	4 2.1	66 35.3	187 29.4
50-64	9 21.4	26 61.9	0 0.0	7 16.7	42 6.6
64+	0 0.0	1 100.0	0 0.0	0.0 0.0	1 .2
No response	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 100.0	1 .2
Column Total	94 14.8	244 38.4	14 2.2	283 44.6	635** 100.0

* Includes respondents who received undergraduate degrees, but not graduate degrees from I.U.S.B. Division of Education.

** Rounding off error.

TABLE 3

Sex of Respondents by Programs Completed through I.U.S.B. Division of Education

	Undergraduate		Graduate		Row Total
	Elementary	Secondary	Elementary	Spec. Ed.	
Male	38 33.3	32 28.1	43 37.7	1 .9	114 16.6
Female	304 53.2	53 9.3	201 35.2	13 2.3	571 83.4
No Response	1 100.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 .2
Column Total	343 50.0	85 12.4	244 35.6	14 2.0	686 * 100.0

* Includes 50 respondents who completed undergraduate and graduate degrees through IUSB Division of Education

TABLE 4

Years of Teaching Experience by Program Completed through I.U.S.B. Division of Education

	Undergraduate		Graduate		Row Total
	Elementary	Secondary	Elementary	Spec. Ed.	
0 - 2	191 67.8	74 26.3	16 5.7	1 .4	282 41.2
3 - 5	122 55.9	10 4.6	78 35.7	8 3.7	218 31.8
6 - 10	21 16.4	1 .8	101 78.8	5 3.9	128 18.7
11 - 20	6 12.2	0 0.0	43 87.8	0 0.0	49 7.2
21 +	0 0.0	0 0.0	6 100.0	0 0.0	6 .9
No Response	3 100.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	3 .4
Column Total	343 50.0	85 12.4	244 35.6	14 2.0	686 100.0

TABLE 5

School District in Which Teaching Respondents Were Employed

	f	% of Total
South Bend Community Schools	135	29.7
Mishawaka School District	39	8.6
Elkhart	51	11.2
Penn-Harris-Madison	30	6.6
Indiana, other than above	153	33.6
Outside Indiana	47	10.3
Column Total	455	100.0

TABLE 6

District of Employment by Areas of School Experience

	No Resp.	Elem self-Contained Classroom	Elem Specialization	Sec.	Spec. Educ.	Guid. Couns.	Adm.	Subst.	Row Total
No response	39 24.4	66 41.3	9 5.6	11 6.9	3 1.9	0 0.0	2 1.3	30 18.7	160 25.2
South Bend	5 3.5	109 75.7	9 6.3	13 9.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	8 5.6	144 22.6
Mishawaka	0 0.0	23 59.0	12 30.8	0 0.0	1 2.6	0 0.0	0 0.0	3 7.7	39 6.1
Elkhart	1 1.8	34 61.8	11 20.0	5 9.1	3 5.5	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 1.8	55 8.6
Penn-Harris-Madison	0 0.0	22 68.8	8 25.0	2 6.3	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	32 5.0
Other in Indiana	3 1.9	114 73.1	17 10.9	12 7.7	2 1.3	1 .6	1 .6	6 3.8	156 24.5
Outside Indiana	6 12.0	30 60.0	4 8.0	3 6.0	1 2.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	6 12.0	50 7.9
Column Total	54 8.5	398 62.6	70 11.0	46 7.2	10 1.6	1 0.2	3 0.5	54 8.5	636 100.0

TABLE 7

Educational Background by Type of Certificate Held

Teaching Certificate / Educational Background	Provisional	Professional	None	Row Total
Bachelors	140 82.8	4 2.4	25 14.8	169 27.0
Bachelors+	183 94.3	5 2.6	6 3.1	194 31.0
Masters	67 29.4	153 67.1	8 3.5	228 36.4
Masters+	7 21.2	26 78.8	0 0.0	33 5.3
Ph.D.	0 0.0	1 50.0	1 50.0	2 .3
Column Total	397 63.4	189 30.2	40 6.4	626* 100.0

* Nonrespondents on this item have been omitted.

TABLE 8

IUSB Undergraduate program completed by reason not teaching

	No desire	Unable to get job	Chose to work outside education	Chose to work in education outside teaching	Row Total
Elem	46 45.1	47 46.1	6 5.9	3 2.9	102 70.3
Sec.	14 32.6	24 55.8	5 11.6	0 0.0	43 29.7
Column Total	60 41.4	71 49.0	11 7.6	3 2.1	145 100.0

TABLE 9

Date of Undergraduate Degree by Reason for Not Teaching at Present

	No desire	Unable to get job	Chose to work outside of education	Chose to work in education outside of teaching	Row Total
Date of Undergraduate Degree					
1967	7 70.0	0 0.0	2 20.0	1 10.0	10 6.7
1968	6 85.7	1 14.3	0 0.0	0 0.0	7 4.7
1969	14 87.5	1 6.3	0 0.0	1 6.3	16 10.7
1970	9 56.3	5 31.3	2 12.5	0 0.0	16 10.7
1971	16 40.0	20 50.0	3 7.5	1 2.5	40 26.7
1972	18 29.5	39 63.9	4 6.6	0 0.0	61 40.7
Column Total	70 46.7	66 44.0	11 7.3	3 2.0	150 100.0

TABLE 10

Number of Hours Completed through I.U.S.B.
Division of Education for Graduate Degree

	Number	Percent
None	157	24.6
1 - 6	72	11.3
7 - 12	43	6.8
13 - 18	44	6.9
19 - 24	29	4.6
25 - 30	55	8.6
31 - 36	149	23.4
37 +	30	4.7
No response	58	9.1
Column Total	637	100.0

TABLE 11

Number of Hours Completed through I.U.S.B. Division of Education for Undergraduate Degree

	Number	Percent
None	174	27.3
1 - 6	19	3.0
7 - 12	18	2.8
13 - 18	51	8.0
19 - 24	70	11.0
25 +	282	44.3
No response	23	3.6
Column total	637	100.0

Evaluation of Teacher Education Program

Table 12 summarizes the ratings of instruction received while taking courses through I.U.S.B. Division of Education by graduate and undergraduate programs completed. The data are presented by frequency count and percent of row for each cell.

Table 13 summarizes the ratings of program advising received while taking courses through I.U.S.B. Division of Education by graduate and undergraduate programs completed. The data are presented by frequency count and percent of row for each cell.

Table 14 summarizes the ratings for instruction and program advising. The null hypothesis was rejected ($p < .001$) for both the ratings of instruction and program advising. Visual inspection revealed that the data were skewed toward Fair/Poor.

TABLE 12

Summary of Ratings of Instruction Received While Taking Courses through I.U.S.B. Division of Education by Graduate and Undergraduate Programs Completed

	Outstanding	Good	Fair	Poor	Row Total
Undergraduate					
Elementary	27 8.0	209 61.8	85 25.2	17 5.0	338
Secondary	7 8.6	48 59.3	22 27.2	4 4.9	81
Graduate					
Elementary	20 8.5	142 60.4	66 28.1	7 3.0	235
Special Education	2 14.3	9 64.3	3 21.4	0 0.0	14

TABLE 13

Summary of Ratings of Program Advising Received While Taking Courses through I.U.S.B. Division of Education by Graduate and Undergraduate Programs Completed

	Outstanding	Good	Fair	Poor	Row Total
Undergraduate					
Elementary	34 10.5	110 33.8	109 33.5	72 22.2	325
Secondary	9 11.2	29 36.2	25 31.2	17 21.2	80
Graduate					
Elementary	29 12.3	108 46.0	65 27.7	33 14.0	235
Special Education	3 21.4	4 28.6	4 28.6	3 21.4	14

TABLE 14

Summary of Ratings for Instruction and Program Advising
Received while taking courses through I.U.S.B. Division of Education

Rating	Outstanding	Good	Fair/Poor	Row Total
Instruction	47 7.6	382 61.8	189 30.6	618 * 100.0
Program Advising Services	66 10.9	234 38.7	305 50.4	605 * 100.0

* $p < .001$

Introductory courses. Table 15 summarizes the responses to the rating of Introduction to Teaching (F100) by undergraduate program completed through I.U.S.B. Division of Education. Table 16 summarizes the responses to the rating of Human Development and Learning (P280) by undergraduate program completed through I.U.S.B. Division of Education. The data on both tables are presented as frequency count and percent of row for each cell.

A summary of the ratings for the introductory courses, F100 and P280, is presented in Table 19. The null hypothesis was rejected ($p < .001$) for the ratings of both courses. Visual inspection revealed that the data were skewed toward Fair/Poor.

Methods courses. A summary of the responses to the rating of methods courses by undergraduate program completed through I.U.S.B. Division of Education is presented in Table 17. The data are presented as frequency count and percent of row for each cell. Table 19 presents a summary of the ratings for the methods courses. The null hypothesis was rejected ($p < .001$). Visual inspection revealed that the data were skewed toward Fair/Poor.

Field experiences other than student teaching. Table 18 summarizes the responses to the rating of field experiences other than student teaching by undergraduate program completed through the I.U.S.B. Division of Education. The data are presented as frequency count and percent of row for each cell. A summary of the ratings for field experiences

TABLE 15

Summary of Responses to Rating of F100 by
Undergraduate Program Completed through I.U.S.B. Division of Education

	No Response	Outstanding	Good	Fair	Poor	Did not take this course at IUSB	Row Total
No response	3 25.0	0 0.0	0 0.0	1 8.3	1 8.3	7 58.3	12 1.9
Elementary	0 0.0	9 2.6	54 15.7	96 28.0	122 35.6	62 18.1	343 53.9
Secondary	2 2.4	1 1.2	8 9.4	24 28.2	21 24.7	29 34.1	85 13.4
Neither	9 4.6	1 .5	7 3.6	3 1.5	2 1.0	174 88.8	196 30.8
Column Total	14 2.2	11 1.7	69 10.8	124 19.5	146 23.0	272 42.8	636 100.0

TABLE 16

Summary of Responses to Rating of P280 by
Undergraduate Program Completed through I.U.S.B. Division of Education

	No Response	Outstanding	Good	Fair	Poor	Did not take this course at IUSB	Row Total
No Response	2 16.7	0 0.0	2 16.7	1 8.3	0 0.0	7 58.3	12 1.9
Elementary	2 .6	61 17.8	95 27.7	66 19.2	49 14.3	70 20.4	343 53.9
Secondary	2 2.4	16 18.8	16 18.8	17 20.0	14 16.5	20 23.5	85 13.4
Neither	10 5.1	3 1.5	8 4.1	7 3.6	1 .5	167 85.2	196 30.8
Column Total	16 2.5	80 12.6	121 19.0	91 14.3	64 10.1	264 41.5	636 100.0

TABLE 17

Summary of Responses to Rating of Methods Courses by
Undergraduate Program Completed through IUSB Division of Education

	No response	Outstanding	Good	Fair	Poor	Did not take these courses at IUSB	Row Total
No response	1 8.3	1 8.3	5 41.7	2 16.7	0 0.0	3 25.0	12 1.9
Elementary	3 0.9	33 9.6	147 42.9	122 35.6	35 10.2	3 0.9	343 53.9
Secondary	1 1.2	10 11.8	24 28.2	20 23.5	28 32.9	2 2.4	85 13.4
Neither	12 6.1	6 3.1	33 16.8	32 16.3	14 7.1	99 50.5	196 30.8
Column Total	17 2.7	50 7.9	209 32.9	176 27.7	77 12.1	107 16.8	636 100.0

TABLE 18

Summary of Responses to Rating of Field Experiences other than Student Teaching by Undergraduate Program Completed through IUSB Division of Education

	No response	Outstanding	Good	Fair	Poor	Did not have any field experience at IUSB	Row Total
No response	2 16.7	0 0.0	2 16.7	0 0.0	0 0.0	8 66.7	12 1.9
Elementary	5 1.5	40 11.7	120 35.0	83 24.2	41 12.0	54 15.7	343 53.9
Secondary	2 2.4	10 11.8	21 24.7	16 18.8	13 15.3	23 27.1	85 13.4
Neither	11 5.6	1 0.5	6 3.1	8 4.1	5 2.6	165 84.2	196 30.8
Column Total	20 3.1	51 8.0	149 23.4	107 16.8	59 9.3	250 39.3	636 100.0

TABLE 19

Summary of Ratings for Introduction to Teaching (F100), Human Development and Learning (P280), Methods courses, and Field Experiences other than Student Teaching

	Outstanding	Good	Fair/Poor	Row Total +
F100	11 3.1	69 19.7	270 77.1	350 * 100.0
P280	80 22.5	121 34.0	155 43.6	356 * 100.0
Methods	50 9.8	208 40.7	253 49.5	511 * 100.0
Field experiences other than student teaching	51 13.9	149 40.7	166 45.3	366 * 100.0

+ These totals include only those respondents who rated these aspects of the teacher education program. Those respondents who indicated that they did not take these courses through IUSB Division of Education were excluded.

* $p < .001$

other than student teaching is contained in Table 19. The null hypothesis was rejected ($p < .001$) for this rating. The data were skewed toward Fair/Poor.

Student Teaching. Tables 20, 21, 22 and 23 summarize the responses for the rating of adequacy of professional preparation for student teaching, university supervisor, supervising teacher, and appropriateness of school situation, respectively. The data are presented as frequency count and percent of row for each cell. A summary of the ratings for these four aspects of student teaching appears in Table 24.

The null hypothesis was rejected ($p < .001$) for the rating of adequacy of professional preparation with the data skewed toward Fair/Poor. The null hypothesis was rejected ($p < .05$) for the rating of the university supervisor with the data skewed toward Fair/Poor. The null hypothesis was rejected ($p < .001$) for the rating of the supervising teacher with the data skewed toward Outstanding. The null hypothesis was rejected ($p < .001$) for the rating of appropriateness of the school situation with the data skewed toward Outstanding.

TABLE 20

Summary of Ratings of Adequacy of Professional Preparation for Student Teaching by Undergraduate Program Completed at IUSB

	Outstanding	Good	Fair	Poor	Row Total
Elementary	80 24.5	167 51.1	64 19.6	16 4.9	327 80.1
Secondary	12 14.8	43 53.1	20 24.7	6 7.4	81 19.9
Column Total	92 22.6	210 51.5	84 20.6	22 5.4	408 100.0

TABLE 21

Summary of Ratings of University Supervisor for Student Teaching by Undergraduate Program Completed at IUSB

	Outstanding	Good	Fair	Poor	Row Total
Elementary	94 28.9	129 39.7	70 21.5	32 9.8	325 80.1
Secondary	17 21.0	32 39.5	20 24.7	12 14.8	81 19.9
Column Total	111 27.3	161 39.7	90 22.2	44 10.8	406 100.0

TABLE 22

Summary of Ratings of Supervising Teacher for Student Teaching by Undergraduate Program Completed at IUSB

	Outstanding	Good	Fair	Poor	Row Total
Elementary	157 47.9	112 34.1	37 11.3	22 6.7	328 80.2
Secondary	37 45.7	29 35.8	11 13.6	4 4.9	81 19.5
Column Total	194 47.4	141 34.5	48 11.7	26 6.4	409

TABLE 23

Summary of Ratings of Appropriateness of School Situation for Student Teaching by Undergraduate Program Completed at IUSB.

	Outstanding	Good	Fair	Poor	Row Total
Elementary	106 32.5	184 56.4	26 8.0	10 3.1	326 80.3
Secondary	31 38.8	40 50.0	4 5.0	5 6.3	80 19.7
Column Total	137 33.7	224 55.2	30 7.4	15 3.7	406

TABLE 24

Summary of Ratings for the Following Aspects of Student Teaching: Adequacy of Professional Preparation, University Supervisor, Supervising Teacher and Appropriateness of School Situation

Rating	Outstanding	Good	Fair/Poor	Row Total +
Adequacy of professional preparation	95 22.6	214 51.0	111 26.5	420** 100.0
University Supervisor	113 27.0	167 39.9	139 33.2	419 * 100.0
Supervising Teacher	197 46.8	147 34.9	77 18.3	421** 100.0
Apprpriateness of School Situation	142 33.8	228 54.3	50 11.9	420** 100.0

* $p < .05$
** $p < .001$

CHAPTER IV

Discussion

These results apply only to the I.U.S.B. Division of Education graduates from 1967 through 1972; therefore, extrapolation to I.U.S.B. graduates in general is inappropriate.

Other limitations of the study include: a small N for graduates of the secondary and special education programs, lack of a validity check on the instrument used, lack of information regarding the nonrespondents, a typographical error on the instrument*, and the difficulty involved in determining the meaning of "no response" to various items on the questionnaire.

Within the above limitations, the following results may be interesting to the reader.

General Information Results

1. Approximately two-thirds of the Division of Education graduates (DEG) were age 34 or under; about 44% were between the ages of 25 and 34.

2. Approximately 67% of the DEG received undergraduate degrees; four-fifths of these undergraduate degrees were in elementary education, the remainder in secondary education.

*Responses four and five for item one were not mutually exclusive.

3. The majority (94.6%) of DEG who received graduate degrees completed the elementary program, the remainder completed the special education program. Approximately 41% of the DEG received graduate degrees from I.U.S.B. Division of Education.

4. While none of those who completed the secondary undergraduate program went on to complete a graduate degree at I.U.S.B., 50 (7.9% of total DEG) elementary undergraduates went on to complete their graduate degrees through I.U.S.B. Division of Education (46 in elementary, 4 in special education).

5. Approximately three-fourths (73%) of the DEG had five years or less of teaching experience.

6. Female DEG outnumber male DEG by about 5 to 1; this ratio was higher for elementary undergraduates (7.5:1) and lower for secondary undergraduates (1.7:1). The ratio of females to males for graduate elementary degrees was 4.7:1 and 13:1 for special education.

7. Almost 90%, of the DEG who were teaching were employed in Indiana; 29.7%, were employed by the South Bend School Corporation. Mishawaka, Elkhart and Penn-Harris-Madison school districts employed 25.7% of the teaching DEG. Approximately one third (33.6%) of the teaching DEG were employed in Indiana but outside these districts.

8. Approximately 63% of the DEG had experience teaching in an elementary self-contained classroom while .5% had experience as an administrator.

9. Approximately 57% of the DEG had not completed their graduate degree although 31% had completed hours beyond their undergraduate degree.

10. More than one-third (36.4%) of the DEG had completed their graduate degree. An additional 5.6% (35) had completed hours beyond this degree. Of this latter group, two had completed the doctorate degree.

11. Provisional teaching certificates were held by 397 (63.4%) of the DEG while 189 (30.2%) hold professional certificates. No certificate was held by at least 40 (6.4%) of the DEG.

12. Of the DEG who had received their undergraduate degrees during 1967-1972 and who were not employed as teachers, 46.7% had no desire to teach at the present time while 44% were unable to get a job teaching. Smaller numbers (7.3%) chose to work outside education or in education outside of teaching (2%).

13. The percentage of DEG (not teaching at present) who were unable to get a job as a teacher was 6.3% for those who received their undergraduate degree in 1969, 31.3% for 1970, 50% for 1971 and 63% for 1972.

14. "No desire to teach at present time" was the reason given for not teaching by 45.1% DEG in undergraduate elementary education and 32.6% of the undergraduate secondary

education DEG. "Unable to get a job" was the reason given by 46.1% of the elementary undergraduates who were not teaching; 55.8% of the secondary undergraduate gave this response.

Evaluation of Teacher Education Program Results

1. DEG rated the instruction they received while taking courses through I.US.B. Division of Education significantly different ($p < .001$) from what was expected. The observed rating was more negative than was expected.

2. DEG rated the program advising they received while taking courses through I.U.S.B. Division of Education significantly different ($p < .001$) from what was expected. The observed rating was more negative than was expected. 50.4% rated program advising as fair or poor.

3. The introductory courses, F100 and P280, were rated significantly different ($p < .001$) from what was expected. The observed ratings were more negative than what was expected. It should be pointed out here that, in most cases, these courses were taken two or more years ago. The courses as they exist now are substantially different from those evaluated by this study.

4. The methods courses were rated significantly different ($p < .001$) from what was expected. The observed ratings were more negative than what was expected.

5. Field experiences other than student teaching were rated significantly different ($p < .001$) from what was expected. The observed ratings were more negative than what was expected.

6. D.E.B. rated the adequacy of their professional preparation for student teaching significantly different ($p < .001$) from what was expected. The observed ratings were slightly more negative than was expected.

7. The university supervisor for student teaching was rated significantly different ($p < .05$) from what was expected. The observed ratings were more negative than was expected.

8. The supervising teacher for student teaching was rated significantly different ($p < .001$) from what was expected.

9. Appropriateness of the school situation for student teaching was rating significantly different ($p < .001$) from what was expected. The observed ratings were more positive than was expected.

CHAPTER V

Conclusions

This study has resulted in more data being available concerning Division of Education graduates than has been available up to this time. In most cases the data supported commonly accepted assumptions. The importance of keeping these data current cannot be overemphasized for many are a function of time.

The evaluation data will serve primarily as a baseline against which the effect of Division changes since 1972 can be measured. This evaluation is merely one phase of a broader and more intensive evaluation now in process in the I.U.S.B. Division.

Appendix A

No: #_____(Office use only)

Directions: Please circle appropriate response for each item.

1. What is your present age?

1. 18 - 24
2. 25 - 34
3. 35 - 49
4. 50 - 64
5. 64+

2. What is your sex?

1. male
2. female

3. How many years of teaching experience do you have? Include current year.

1. less than 1 yrs.
2. 1 - 2 yrs
3. 3 - 5 yrs.
4. 6 - 10 yrs.
5. 11 - 20 yrs.
6. 21 + yrs.

4. If teaching at present time, where are you teaching?

1. South Bend Community Schools
2. Mishawaka School District
3. Elkhart
4. Penn-Harris-Madison
5. Indiana, other than above
   Specify_____
6. Outside Indiana
   Specify_____

5. What is your educational background?

1. Bachelor's degree
2. Bachelor's degree + hrs._____
3. Master's degree
4. Master's degree + hrs. _____
5. Specialist's degree
   Major_____
6. Doctorate
   Major_____

6. Which undergraduate program did you complete through course work at IUSB?

1. Bachelor's in Elem. Ed.
2. Bachelor's in Secdy. Ed.
3. None of the above

Major_____Minor_____
Major_____Minor_____

7. When did you receive your undergraduate degree?

1. 1967
2. 1968
3. 1969
4. 1970
5. 1971
6. 1972

8. How many hours of education couse work did you complete through the IUSB Division of Education for your undergraduate degree?

1. none
2. 1 - 6
3. 7 - 12
4. 13 - 18
5. 19 - 24
6. 25 +

9. When did you receive your graduate (Master's) degree from IUSB?

1. 1970
2. 1971
3. 1972
4. Have not received graduate degree
5. Completed graduate degree elsewhere
   Specify_____

10. Which graduate program did you complete for your degree through IUSB?

1. Master's in Elem. Ed.
2. Master's in Spec. Ed.
3. Did not complete IUSB graduate degree

11. How many hours of education couse work have you completed through the IUSB Division of Education for your graduate degree? (Include current semester)

1. none
2. 1 - 6
3. 7 - 12
4. 13 - 18
5. 19 - 24
6. 25 - 30
7. 31 - 36
8. 37 +

12. How would you rate your training in Introduction to Teaching (F100) as preparation for your teaching career?

1. Outstanding
2. Good
3. Fair
4. Poor
5. Did not take this course at IUSB

Comments_____
_____
_____

13. How would you rate your training in Human Development and Learning (P280) as preparation for your teaching career?

1. Outstanding
2. Good
3. Fair
4. Poor
5. Did not take this course at IUSB

Comments_____

14. How would you rate your training in education methods course(s) as preparation for your teaching career?

1. Outstanding
2. Good
3. Fair
4. Poor
5. Did not take this course at IUSB

Comments_____

15. How would you rate your field experiences (other than student teaching) as preparation for your teaching career?

1. Outstanding
2. Good
3. Fair
4. Poor
5. Did not have any field experiences at IUSB

Comments_____

16-19

If you did your student teaching through IUSB, rate your student teaching experience in the following areas.

Adequacy of your professional preparation
1. Outstanding
2. Good
3. Fair
4. Poor

Comments_____

University supervisor
1. Outstanding
2. Good
3. Fair
4. Poor

Comments_____

Supervising teacher
1. Outstanding
2. Good
3. Fair
4. Poor

Comments_____

Appropriateness of school situation
1. Outstanding
2. Good
3. Fair
4. Poor

Comments_____

20. How would you rate the instruction you received while taking courses in the Division of Education at IUSB?

1. Outstanding
2. Good
3. Fair
4. Poor

Comments_____

21. How would you rate the program advising services you received in the Division of Education at IUSB concerning your major or degree requirements?

1. Outstanding
2. Good
3. Fair
4. Poor

Comments_____

22. What type of teaching certificate do you have at the present time?

1. Provisional — Major_____ Minor_____
2. Professional (life) — Major_____ Minor_____
3. None

23. Identify the areas and amount of school experience you have had. (Including this year)

	Years Experience
1. Elem. - self contained classroom	_____
2. Elem. - specialization in _____	_____
3. Secdy. - specialization in _____	_____
4. Spec. Ed. - specialization in _____	_____
5. Guidance counselor	_____
6. Administrator	_____
7. Substitute teacher	_____

24. If you are not teaching at the present time, specify reason.

1. Do not desire to teach at present time
2. Unable to get teaching job
3. Chose to work outside of education
4. Chose to work in education outside of teaching

(over)

Appendix B

INDIANA UNIVERSITY at SOUTH BEND
1825 NORTHSIDE BOULEVARD
SOUTH BEND, INDIANA 46615

DIVISION OF EDUCATION
SPECIAL EDUCATION

1820
1970

TEL. NO. 219—282-2341

March 30, 1973

Dear I.U.S.B. Graduate:

Enclosed you will find a questionnaire designed to evaluate our teacher education program. As an I.U.S.B. graduate, you are in an excellent position to provide this evaluation. Since you are the only source from which we can obtain this type of data, we need, and would appreciate, your assistance. Therefore, we are asking you to please complete the enclosed form and return to the Division of Education at I.U.S.B. by April 20th. Your anonymity will be perserved throughout this survey. This information and any additional comments you make will be most helpful for us as we develop future programs.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Gratefully,

Judith A. Redwine

Judith A. Redwine, Ph.D.
Coordinator of Professional Education

JAR/gc
enclosure

INDIANA UNIVERSITY at SOUTH BEND
1825 NORTHSIDE BOULEVARD
SOUTH BEND, INDIANA 46615

DIVISION OF EDUCATION

TEL. NO. 219 - 282-4141

May 4, 1973

Dear I.U.S.B. Graduate:

Several weeks ago you received a questionnaire which was part of an evaluation of our teacher education program. Since you, as an I.U.S.B. graduate, can contribute valuable information to this evaluation process, we are anxious for your contribution to this effort. As of this date, we have not yet received your completed questionnaire. We have enclosed another in the event you might have misplaced the earlier form. Please complete this form and return it by May 25th. Your cooperation in this effort to improve our teacher education program will be appreciated.

Gratefully,

Judith A. Redwine

Judith A. Redwine, Ph.D.
Coordinator of Professional
Education

JAR:br
Enc.

Appendix C is contained

in a separate volume.

REFERENCES

Best, J. W. Research in education. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1959.

Borg, W. R. & Gall, M. D. Educational research: An introduction. New York: David McKay Company, 1971.

DuVall, C. R. Follow-up study of 1967-1972 graduates of Indiana University at South Bend. Research in education 7:0 ED061882, August 1972.

DuVall, C. R. The descriptive or normative survey method. In R. H. Jones (Ed.), Methods and techniques of educational research. Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1973.

Furno, O. F. Sample survey designs in education: Focus on administrative utilization. Review of Educational Research, 1966, 36 (5), 552-565.

Good, C. V. Introduction to educational research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959.

Levine, S. & Gordon, G. Maximizing returns on mail questionnaires. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1958, 22, 568-575.

Mouly, G. J. The science of educational research. New York: American Book Company, 1963.